

REMARKS

In view of the above amendment, Applicants believe the pending application is in condition for allowance.

Claims 2, 4, 5, and 7-37 are now present in this application. Claims 2, 4, 7, 12, 19, 24, 31, 34, and 37 are independent. By this amendment, claims 1, 3, 6, and 38 have been cancelled, without prejudice or disclaimer, and claim 37 has been amended.

Reconsideration of this application, as amended, is respectfully requested.

Priority Under 35 U.S.C. § 119

The Examiner has previously acknowledged the papers submitted under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d), which have been placed of record in the file.

Previously, the Examiner stated that priority had not been given Korean Patent Application No. 10-2002-074096 because allegedly the application does not claim the same subject matter.

Applicants argued that at least claims 34-36 were directed to the subject matter of Korean Patent Application No. 10-2002-074096 filed November 26, 2002.

Acknowledgment thereof by the Examiner in the next Office Action is respectfully requested.

Restriction Requirement

The Examiner has made the Restriction Requirement final, and has withdrawn claims 34-36 from further consideration. However, the Office Action is silent as to Applicants' remarks submitted May 3, 2007 pointing out that claims 34-36 had been previously allowed in an earlier Office Action dated October 17, 2006 and therefore fails to establish what serious burden exists as set forth in M.P.E.P. § 803 that would justify withdrawing claims 34-36 from further consideration.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 112, 2nd Paragraph

Claims 1, 3, and 6 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, 2nd Paragraph. Because claims 1, 3, and 6 have been cancelled, thus rendering this rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, 2nd Paragraph moot.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1, 3, and 6 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Novotny. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

A complete discussion of the Examiner's rejection is set forth in the Office Action, and is not being repeated here.

While not conceding the appropriateness of the Examiner's rejection, but merely to advance prosecution of the instant application, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 1, 3, and 6 have been cancelled, thus rendering this rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) moot. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection are respectfully requested.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claim 37 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Novotny. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

A complete discussion of the Examiner's rejection is set forth in the Office Action, and is not being repeated here.

With regard to the rejection of claim 37, while not conceding the appropriateness of the Examiner's rejection, but merely to advance prosecution of the instant application, Applicants respectfully submit that independent claim 37 has been amended to include the limitations of objected-to allowable claim 38, thereby automatically placing independent claim 37 into condition for allowance.

Allowable Subject Matter

The Examiner states claims 2, 4, 5, and 7-33 are allowed and that claim 38 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form.

Applicants thank the Examiner for the early indication of allowable subject matter in this application. As set forth above, the limitations of objected-to claim 38 have been added into independent claim 37, and therefore independent claim 37 should be in condition for allowance.

Additional Cited References

Since the remaining references cited by the Examiner have not been utilized to reject the claims, but have merely been cited to show the state of the art, no comment need be made with respect thereto.

Office Action

The Office Action contains numerous characterizations of the invention, the claims, and the related art, with which Applicants do not necessarily agree. Unless expressly noted otherwise, Applicants decline to subscribe to any statement or characterization in the Office Action.

Conclusion

All of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all presently outstanding rejections and that they be withdrawn. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action, and as such, the present application is in condition for allowance.


If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone Chad D. Wells, Registration No. 50,875, at (703) 205-8000, in the Washington, D.C. area.

Prompt and favorable consideration of this Amendment is respectfully requested.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 or 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Dated: December 26, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Esther H. Chong

Registration No.: 40,953

BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP

8110 Gatehouse Road

Suite 100 East

P.O. Box 747

Falls Church, Virginia 22040-0747

(703) 205-8000

Attorney for Applicants